

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for June 29, 1949, and direct your attention to an article "Around the Globe," by Joseph Starobin, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this article by Mr. 6847 Starobin in the Daily Worker for June 29, 1949.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the view of the Communist Party toward the political situation in Viet Nam as of that date? A. In my opinion it reflects the policies advocated by the Communist Party of the United States with respect to the struggle going on in Indo-China, of which Viet Nam is one part. It makes definite recommendations concerning both French and United States policy on this question.

These recommendations and this interpretation are directly parallel with those advanced by the official Soviet press on this question and at that same general time.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination from the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion regarding the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the Civil War which raged in Greece during the postwar years? A. Yes, I have, on the basis of numerous statements made by Soviet spokesmen at public meetings and at international conferences, as well as through the Soviet press and the press of the International Communist movement.

Q. I would like to direct your attention again, Dr. Mosely, to that article which appears in Pravda for October 22, 1947, the article by Zhdanov entitled "The International 6848 Situation," Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 214, and ask you whether in your opinion this report reflects the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the political situation existing in Greece as of that date. A. Yes, in my opinion it does. This is a highly authoritative statement of the Soviet interpretation of the situation and of its recommendations and policy.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 241—.

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 241.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the USSR Information Bulletin for April 22, 1949, which contains the text of a speech on the question of "The Veto and the Aggressive North Atlantic Bloc," made by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the General Assembly of the United Nations on April 13, 1949 and direct your attention to what is marked "A, the Greek Question" in that speech, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this speech.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that speech reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the so-called Greek question. A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is a detailed and authoritative statement of the Soviet position concerning the struggle which has been going on in Greece since the mid-summer of 1946 which came to an end a few weeks after the speech.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 242—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 242.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the verbatim minutes of the 99th Plenary meeting of the United Nations held in the General Assembly Hall at Flushing Meadows, New York, Tuesday 21 of October 1947, and direct your attention to the speech made by Mr. Kiselev, representative of Byelorussian Socialist Republic, and ask you whether you have ever read that report.

A. Yes, sir. I have read this verbatim report of the speech made by Kiselev. Mr. Kiselev is the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which has a Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but according to the Soviet constitution those republics which have separate ministries of

foreign affairs follow the broad lines of policy laid down by the All-Union Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, would this speech reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Greek guerilla question as of this date? A. Yes, it does. It is a typical presentation of the nature and course of the struggle in Greece. It advocates the same measures 6850 which have been advocated since the summer of 1946 by the Soviet Government, down to the termination of the struggle in Greece in 1949.

Q. Dr. Mosely, with your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the Civil War in Greece? A. Yes, I have, on the basis of the official statements, resolutions, and other authorized articles published in the official press of the Communist Party in the United States.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 243—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 243.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for November 1948, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 969 entitled "Greece and the American People's Tasks," and ask you whether you have read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article at the time and since. It is a typical interpretation of the events in Greece. It gives its full approval to the policy followed by, and advocated by the Soviet Government and urges that the

6851 American Government should adopt the same policy.

It is directly parallel to the contemporaneous expressions of official Soviet opinion.

6854 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 244—

Q. —a publication put out by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, documents on the Soviet Union and the Berlin question, and direct your attention to the note from the Soviet Government to the Government of the United States of America, July 14, 1948 and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this document, in Russian in the Soviet Press shortly after it was issued, and I have read it in translation into English.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that document reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Government toward the internal political situation in Germany as of that 6855 date? A. Yes, it does. It throws upon the three western powers and the freely elected German authorities in Western Germany all responsibility for the division of the country into these two major parts. It advocates the reunion of the two major parts of the country on a basis of equality of representation of the two parts in a constituent council, despite the fact that the population of the Western zones is about 48 million and that of the Eastern zone about 19 million. The basis of parity of representation was thus advocated by the Socialist Unity Party in Germany, in the Soviet zone of Germany, and by the Soviet Government. It throws upon the elected leaders of the people of Western Germany, upon the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France, all responsibility for failure to overcome the division of Germany into these two major parts.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like to show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 245—

Q. —which is an issue of Pravda for October 22, 1950, which contains a declaration of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia,

Poland, Roumania, Hungary, and the German Democratic Republic, concerning the decisions of the New York three-power conference on the remilitarization of Western Germany, and ask you whether you have ever read that declaration before. A. Yes, I read this declaration on the following day as transmitted by the American press, and I also read it in Russian a few days later and in Pravda. I have read the translation which is presented here.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that declaration reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the internal political situation of Germany, on the so-called German question, as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this is a highly authoritative statement of the position of the Soviet Government of the whole question of Germany as of that time. It repeats and expands the main assertions concerning the origins of the situation and it advocates the same proposals for the unification of Germany on the bases which had all along been described by the Soviet Government as the only acceptable ones and which were not acceptable to the freely elected government in Western Germany or to the three western powers.

6857 Q. Dr. Mosely, was there a blockade of Berlin in 1948? A. Yes, in effect there was. Beginning in early April 1948, various measures, allegedly technical in character, were taken which began to impede the movement of persons and goods between Berlin and the Western zones. In the second half of June 1948 these technical measures ordered by the Soviet military authorities were intensified to the point where all movement by land or water on the part of goods and persons going to or from the western zones and western Berlin, including allied personnel, was cut off except for one purely allied military train each way per day.

Q. I would like to refer to the notes of the Soviet Government to the Government of the United States, July 14, 1948, and October 3, 1948, contained in the publication, The Soviet

Union and the Berlin Question, which you have already stated you have read, and ask you whether in your opinion—

MR. ABT: That is an exhibit which has been identified earlier?

6858 MR. LENVIN: Yes.

MRS. LAFOLLETTE: That is 244, Mr. Abt.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. And I ask you whether in your opinion, Dr. Mosely, those notes reflect the attitude and views of the Soviet Government toward the blockade of Berlin which you have just described. A. Yes, in my opinion they do. I have read and studied carefully both notes in both Russian and English. These are official notes transmitted by the Soviet Government to the Government of the United States, and similar notes were transmitted by it to the governments of France and Great Britain. They set forth the interpretation, the claims and the recommendations of the Soviet Government on the whole question of the future of Germany as well as of the access to Berlin.

6859 A. The Soviet Government maintained that the breakdown of the joint allied administration of Berlin from whatever causes that development arose, meant that three western powers had no further right to maintain their forces or their authority in any part of Berlin. The Soviet Government offered to withdraw these measures and to restore the previous position prior to June 1948 if the western powers would agree to the conditions which the Soviet Government had advanced as the basis for forming a unified German government.

6860 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other material which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to what the views and attitude of that Party were toward the political situation in Ger-

many and the blockade of Berlin? A. Through its official statements and the published statements of their spokesmen, the Communist Party of the United States gave strong criticism to the course of events in the three Western Zones, opposed the formation of the West German Republic, praised the developments in the Soviet Zone and the formation of the people's democratic republic in the Soviet Zone. It upheld the Soviet contentions concerning the basis for putting a stop to land and water traffic between West Berlin and the Western Zones. At each stage in my opinion the Communist Party of the United States supported the Soviet contentions and the recommendations of policy advanced by the Soviet Government. Its reasoning and its 6861 recommendations were directly parallel to those advanced by official Soviet spokesmen and the official Soviet press.

MR. MARCANTONIO: Just so that the record will from time to time show it, we have a continuing objection to all these questions and these answers.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: That is correct.

BY MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 246—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 246.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Which is the Daily Worker for Tuesday, July 20, 1948, and direct your attention to page 3, which contains an article entitled "U.S. Spurs Cold War in Berlin Crisis" and an editorial entitled "Adventures in Germany," and ask you whether you have read those items before. A. Yes, I have read these items in the Daily Worker of July 20, 1948, at the time and since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, do those items reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the German situation as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion they

are typical expressions of the opinions and recommendations of the Communist Party in the United States regarding the situation in Germany and in Berlin. They
6862 are parallel to the positions advanced by the Soviet spokesmen at that time.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 247—

(The document referred to was marked for identification
Petitioner's Exhibit No. 247.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Which is the issue of Political Affairs for March 1947, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 204 entitled "The German Problem and Big Three Unity," and ask you if you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article by Joseph Clark, which appeared in Political Affairs for March 1947.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the German question as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it expresses full support for the policy pursued by the Soviet Government in Germany as a whole, in the Soviet Zone, and its support of the Soviet Unity Party of Eastern Germany. It runs directly parallel with the main contentions and recommendations of Soviet policy at that time.

6863 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been
248— marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.

(The document referred to was marked for identification
Petitioner's Exhibit No. 248.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for November 1948, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 951 entitled "The Wall Street-Washington Peace Panic," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article at the time

and since. It is a typical presentation of the views of the Communist Party of the United States concerning the developments in Germany and Berlin. It gives full support to the position taken by the Soviet Government at that time and on this question. Its explanation of the background and the possible remedies for the situation are directly parallel with those advanced in the official Soviet press.

6871 Q. I would like to ask, Dr. Mosely, whether in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union, you have been able to form any opinion regarding the Soviet views and attitude toward those facets of American foreign policy generally termed the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan and the resultant program of Economic Cooperation Administration.

THE WITNESS: I have formed an opinion. The Soviet Press, of the Government and the Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union, has commented frequently and at great length on these two major aspects of United States policy since 1947.

6872 By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Referring for a moment to that exhibit which is already in for identification which we have marked as Exhibit M-1 and which is Petitioner's Exhibit marked No. 214, in your examination of that report by Mr. Zhdanov appearing in Pravda for October 22, 1947, does that report reveal one of the purposes of the founding meeting of the Information Bureau of the Communist Party, do you recall? A. Yes, it does. The purpose of the Conference of several Communist Parties called in Poland in the second half of September 1947 was to mobilize all possible forces in opposition to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan of Economic Aid for the recovery of Europe. It attacked both of these policies bitterly as aggressive steps,

preparation for war, for an aggressive war, and for the establishment of United States domination over the world, and declared that the Parties there represented had as their duty to combat it in every way and to defeat both of these plans as they described them, and called upon all like-minded persons and groups throughout the world to join in the struggle which it described as a struggle against American Imperialism and Militarism.

6873 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 249—

Q. —which is an issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for December 2, 1949, and would like to direct your attention to the report submitted to the meeting of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties held in the second half of November 1949 by M. Suslov, entitled "Defense of Peace and the Struggle Against the Warmongers," and ask you whether or not you have ever read that report. A. Yes, I have read this both in the Russian language in the Soviet press at the time and in the English version presented by the magazine For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, under date of December 2, 1949. Mr. Suslov has for many years since roughly 1934 been considered an important and authoritative spokesman of the Soviet Government. He has served at different times as alternate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union and as a member at various times of the very important Committee on Organization and the Committee on Propaganda, both subdivisions of the

6874 Central Committee of the Communist Party Bolshevik. This statement is, then, one that I consider authoritative as an expression of the Soviet point of view.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 250 for identification—

Q. —which is the USSR Information Bulletin for May 26, 1948, and direct your attention to the statements of V. M. Molotov and U.S. Ambassador Smith, which is a translation of a Tass release published by the Soviet Daily Press, and ask you whether you have ever read these statements before. A. Yes, I read these statements on the day following their release in Moscow. I read them again carefully 6875 in Russian in the Soviet Press, and I have read them in this English version presented by the USSR Information Bulletin of May 26, 1948.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does the statement of Mr. Molotov reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet toward those facets of American foreign policy which we have mentioned previously? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. Mr. Molotov, then Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, was speaking on instructions of his government, and this statement that he made was reduced to writing and published widely by the Soviet Government. In this statement the Soviet Government attacks the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan or ECA program, and the North Atlantic Treaty organization as aggressive steps preparatory to attacking the Soviet Union and establishing domination over the world.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 251—

Q. —an issue of Pravda for January 29, 1949, which contains a statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR concerning the North Atlantic Pact, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I 6876 read this in excerpt on the following day as transmitted by Tass to the United Press. I read it in full in Pravda in Russian within a few days and have studied it frequently since. I have read the English translation from the Russian into English.

THE WITNESS: It is an official statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR. It attacks strongly, in concept and in its details, the North Atlantic Pact. It describes the world as divided into two camps, the camp for peace which is led by the USSR, and the camp for war which it states is led by the United States. It asserts that the purpose of the conclusion of this regional pact is to prepare an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and those states allied to it.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I would like to refer again to what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 249, which we first marked Exhibit M-2, which is the issue For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for December 2, 1949, and which contains the report by Suslov entitled "Defense of Peace and the Struggle Against the Warmongers," and ask you whether in your opinion that article reflects the view of the Soviet Government on the proposition that the world is divided into two camps, the imperialist camp being 6877 that of the United States and the peace camp that of the Soviet Union. A. Yes. The speech by Mr. Suslov takes this concept of the division of the world into two opposite and contrasting camps as the whole basis of his analysis of the world situation at the time he was speaking.

Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward those facets of American foreign policy that we have been discussing, to wit, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and the ECA? A. Yes, I have. Through its official pronouncements and through the publications of its official press the Communist Party of the United States has taken a definite position in respect to each of these major aspects of United States foreign policy since 1947.

The Communist Party has attacked all three of those aspects of policy as imperialist, militarist, aggressive. It has contrasted the policy of the Soviet Union and of the countries which support its position, calling their position one of support of peace and democracy, and stating constantly that the position upheld by the United States and those countries and groups which support it is one of militarism, imperialism, aggression, of preparing an aggressive war for the destruction of the Soviet Union.

6878 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 252—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 252.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is our M-100, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 675, which is the text of a report delivered at the June 27-30 meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, entitled "American Imperialism and the War Danger," by William Z. Foster, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article at the time it was published, and since. It was published in the August 1947 issue of Political Affairs. It characterizes the world as divided into two contrasting camps. It attributes the support of peace and democracy solely to what it calls the Soviet Camp and it attributes the aims of imperialism, militarism, aggression and domination of the world to the United States. In its interpretation of world affairs of that date and in its recommendations of policy it parallels closely the official position of the Soviet Government and of the Soviet official and Party press.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 253—

6879 (The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 253.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for April 1948, and direct your attention to a statement commencing on page 304, entitled "The Communist Position on the Marshall Plan, Statement of the Communist Party, USA, to the Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, on the Proposed European Recovery Program," submitted February 17, 1948, and ask you whether you have ever read that statement before. A. Yes, I have read this statement at the time and more recently. It is an official statement presented by the Communist Party of the United States to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. It sets forth the interpretation of that body of the then State of Foreign Affairs and presents concrete recommendations for the conduct of United States foreign policy. Its interpretations and its recommendations parallel closely the interpretations and recommendations of the Soviet official policy and of the Soviet Press.

6880 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been
254— marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 254.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of The Worker for Sunday, April 3, 1949, and specifically direct your attention to an editorial entitled "Peace Pact or War Axis?" and ask you whether you have ever read that editorial before. A. Yes, I read this editorial in the Sunday Worker April 3, 1949.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this editorial reflect the views of the Communist Party toward the North Atlantic Pact? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is an editorial in the customary place of editorials. It is also typical of many of that general time on the same problems of foreign

policy. Its interpretation and its recommendations are parallel to those presented by the Soviet official press and by the International Communist organ.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 255—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 255.)

6881

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for July 1950, and I direct your attention specifically to the text of the farewell address, slightly abridged, of an extemporaneous farewell address delivered at the Manhattan Center, New York, on May 2, 1950, by Eugene Dennis entitled "Let us March Forward with Supreme Confidence," and specifically direct your attention to page 11 of the Exhibit which contains the speech, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, do those remarks as stated on page 11 reflect the views of the Communist Party toward those facets of American Foreign Policy which we have been discussing? A. Yes, in my opinion they do. Mr. Dennis stated that his Party had spearheaded the opposition to the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and the North Atlantic Anti-Communist War Pact, that it also headed the campaign to achieve a pact of peace with the Soviet Union and to prevent the revival of Nazism and militarism in Germany and in Japan.

6883

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have emanated from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the State of Yugoslavia from the period commencing with the cessation of hostilities in Europe, World War II, until June of 1948? A. Yes, I have.

Q. Will you state what in your opinion that attitude was?

A. On the basis of many expressions of opinion and interpretation by the Soviet press and Soviet spokesmen, I conclude that during that period between the end of the war in Europe and approximately the beginning of June 1948 the Soviet Government and the leaders of the Communist Party Bolshevik in the Soviet Union highly approved of the development in Yugoslavia, regarded the political development in Yugoslavia as a progressive and important step and held up the Yugoslav development as a model for other so-called people's democracies to follow. In international affairs the Soviet Government gave general and very considerable support to the new Yugoslav regime in the assertion of its position and its claims. At the founding meeting of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties, the Yugoslav representative gave the second speech directly after the representative of the Soviet Union and before the representatives of Communist or Workers Parties participating in the conference were heard.

Q. Dr. Moseley, I would like again to refer to what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 213, which was Comrade V. M. Molotov's speech at the Press Conference at the Soviet Embassy in London, which appeared in Izvestia for September 20, 1945, and what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 214, which is the report or article by Zhdanov entitled "The International Situation," as it appeared in Pravda for October 22, 1947, and ask you whether in your opinion both Mr. Molotov's speech and Mr. Zhdanov's report reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the State of Yugoslavia as of those times. A. Yes, I have examined both of these statements in detail on a number of occasions. In the statement of September 1945 Mr. Molotov expressed full satisfaction with the course of development in Yugoslavia and praised the regime in control of that country. In his speech at the founding conference of the Cominform

in late September 1947 the late Mr. Zhdanov similarly expressed great pride in the achievements of the regime then in control of Yugoslavia.

From these statements one must conclude that at 6885 both times these two responsible Soviet leaders were completely satisfied with and pleased with the course of development in Yugoslavia, and these expressions of views are merely typical of many other similar expressions of Soviet views during that period.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and publications issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the State of Yugoslavia from about 1945 to June of 1948? A. Yes, I have.

Q. Will you state what in your opinion those views and attitudes were? A. On numerous occasions the Communist Party of the United States, through official statements and through its official press, expressed its approval of the course of developments in Yugoslavia, expressed its pride in the achievements of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in reshaping the whole political and economic structure of the country, and expressed support for the aims of the Yugoslav Government at that time. These interpretations of events and recommendations of policy were directly parallel to the official Soviet view and official Soviet policy of that time.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like to refer briefly to what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.

216, which is the article entitled "The National Question in Europe," by William Z. Foster, which appeared in Political Affairs for June 1947, and ask you whether in your opinion that article fairly reflects the views and attitudes of the Communist Party toward the state of Yugoslavia as of that date. A. Yes. I have examined this article by Mr. Foster on a number of occasions and in detail. It is in my opinion an authoritative statement of the views of the Communist Party of the United States concerning the problems of Eastern Europe and including

the problems of Yugoslavia. It expresses full approval of the developments in Yugoslavia and its interpretation is directly parallel to the official interpretations of the Soviet Press of that time.

Q. Dr. Mosely, was I correct in my understanding that you testified that you were a member of the Yugoslav Commission—I don't have the name correctly—on the question of settling the matter of Trieste? A. Yes. From early February 1946 until the Commission ended its work in the middle of May 1946, I was the United States Commissioner on the four-Power Commission to investigate the Yugoslav-Italian boundary and to make recommendations to the Council of Foreign Ministers. The Commission held 138 meetings, averaging four hours each, sometimes beginning at nine in the morning and lasting until two or three the next morning. The record was 4:30 one morning, having begun at ten o'clock the previous morning.

6887 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 256—

Q. —which is an issue of the Daily Worker for May 28, 1946, and direct your attention to the article "Trieste and the Right of Self-Determination," which is a statement by the Secretariat of the Communist Party, USA, and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this article.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the State of Yugoslavia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this was presented as an official analysis and recommendation by the Secretariat of the Communist Party of the United States. It supports fully the Yugoslav contentions concerning this issue, and its recommendations as of that time were directly parallel with those which were supported by the Government of the Soviet Union.

Q. I also show you; Dr. Mosely, an issue of the Worker for Sunday May 19, 1946, which has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 257—

Q. —and direct your attention to an editorial entitled "The Aid-Quisling Policy," and ask you whether you have ever read that editorial. A. Yes, I read this editorial in the Sunday Worker of May 19, 1946.

Q. In your opinion does that editorial reflect the view of the Communist Party toward the State of Yugoslavia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It expresses close support for the actions taken by the Yugoslav Government at that time on this particular question. It describes Mikhailovich as a Judas. Its attitude on this matter as of that time was directly parallel to the attitude taken by the official Soviet and the International Communist publications.

Q. Dr. Mosely, did there come a time when the
6889 views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward Yugoslavia, which you have previously described, underwent a change? A. Yes, this change became known officially on June 28, 1948, through the publication of the report of the Second Conference of the Cominform which had been held in Roumania in early June. This report was published first in the Communist newspaper in Prague, Rudé Právo, and simultaneously published in The Communist and other organs of the Communist press in many parts of the world.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 258—

Q. —which is an issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for November 29, 1949, and specifically direct your attention to the article appearing in that issue which is a resolution of the Information Bureau
6890 entitled "Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the Power of Murderers and Spies," and ask you

whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this resolution published in *For a Lasting Peace* of November 29, 1949, the report of a meeting held in the second half of November 1949 at an unnamed locality in Hungary. This resolution was widely publicized at the time primarily in the Communist Press of various countries, including the Soviet Union.

Q. In your opinion, then, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the view and attitude of the Soviet Union and the International Communist movement toward the State of Yugoslavia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this was intended to be received as an authoritative statement of the attitude of the conference of Communist Parties held at that time in Hungary. Among the Communist Parties which were reported to be represented were those of Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, France, Czechoslovakia, and Italy. Among the representatives listed as representing their parties were Mr. Suslov for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, together with Mr. Yudin, who has frequently been referred to as the responsible editor of the magazine *For a Lasting Peace*. Among the representatives of the French Party was Mr. Duclos.

6891 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been
259— marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No.

Q. —which is an issue of *New Times* identified as No. 48, 1950, and direct your attention to an article appearing therein by A. Piradov, entitled "Tito Yugoslavia—Ramp for American Aggression," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article in the Russian version of *New Times* shortly after it appeared in Moscow, and I have read it in the English version of *New Times* under No. 48 of 1950.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion does this article reflect the attitude of the Soviet Government toward Yugoslavia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this is a typical Soviet interpretation of the development in Yugoslavia and affecting Yugoslavia.

6892 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the materials and other publications which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the State of Yugoslavia or the Government of Yugoslavia after June of 1948? A. Yes. I have. In its official publications the Communist party of the United States has commented frequently and in great detail on Yugoslav developments since June 28, 1948. In fact, it is my recollection that the first comment along the new line came on June 29, 1948, in the form of a denunciation of the regime in Yugoslavia, which for several years prior to that date and since that date has been headed by the same person, with one or two minor exceptions. Marshal Tito now in his turn was called a Judas.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 260—

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for August 1948, and direct your attention to "Statement on the Information Bureau Resolution Concerning the Situation in the CP of Yugoslavia," issued to the Press June 29, 1948, and ask you whether you have ever read that statement before. A. Yes, I have read the statement at the 6893 time and since.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does this statement reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Government of Yugoslavia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It was issued to the press on June 29, 1948. It accuses the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia of abandoning working class in-

ternationalism, of expressing hostility to the Communist Party of the USSR. It accuses it of many other matters with which I need not take up your time. It calls for strong opposition to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and thereby to the regime in Yugoslavia and implies that the United States has brought this about through its war-mongering policy. In its general interpretation it follows, closely the point of view taken publicly on the previous day by the published resolution of the Cominform.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 261—

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for November 20, 1950, and direct your attention to an editorial entitled "Tito Sells Cannon Fodder," and ask you whether you have ever read that editorial before.

6894 THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this editorial in the Daily Worker of November 20, 1950.

(By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that editorial reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Government of Yugoslavia as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does. It is generally typical of the interpretation of Yugoslav events which has been given by the Communist Party of the United States since the end of June 1948.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 262—

6895 Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for August 1948, and direct your attention to an article commencing on page 701 entitled "The Yugoslav leaders on the Path of Betrayal," by V. J. Jerome, and ask you

whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I read this article in Political Affairs for August 1948 by Mr. V. J. Jerome.

Q. In your opinion, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Yugoslav government as of that date? A. Yes, as of that general time, following the rupture of June 28, 1948, it is a typical expression of views of the Communist Party of the United States on this problem. As such, it follows very closely the interpretation and recommendations put forward at that same general time by the official Soviet Press and by the organ of the International Communist movement.

6896 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the national elections which were held in Italy in 1948? A. Yes, I have. In the Soviet Press the interpretation given to the elections was that the Communist Party of Italy was struggling for the defense of peace and democracy and against war and against world domination allegedly sought by the United States. The Soviet Press made very clear its attitude toward the elections in Italy and its full support for the position set forth by the Communist Party of Italy, and the same position was taken by the Cominform Journal, "For a Lasting Peace."

Q. Now I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 263—

Q. —which is an issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for May 1, 1948, and direct your attention to an article entitled "The Italian Election," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

A. Yes, I have read this article which appeared in 6897 "For a Lasting Peace" of May 1948.

Q. In your opinion does this article reflect the views and attitude of the International Communist movement concerning the Italian election of 1948? A. Yes, in my opinion it does represent the interpretation which was approved by the Cominform.

Q. Dr. Mosely, will you identify for the Board Mr. Palmiro Togliatti?

THE WITNESS: Since his return to Italy in approximately February 1944 Mr. Togliatti has been the leading figure and spokesman of the Communist Party of Italy. He was previously known under the name of Ercoli. Mr. Togliatti was for a number of years a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and he has represented the Communist Party of Italy at conferences of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties known as the Cominform.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. There was an attempt on Mr. Togliatti's life, was there not, Dr. Mosely? A. Yes. I read of this in the press.

Q. In your examination of the materials issued or emanating from the Soviet Union or from the Communist Information Bureau, have you been able to form any opinion as to whether the Communist Information Bureau or the Soviet Union took a certain stand or attitude toward this attempted assassination?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have. Both the Soviet Press of that time and the organ of the Cominform commented in considerable detail upon this attempted assassination of Signore Togliatti. The Soviet Press stated roundly that the attempted assassination had been instigated by the United States. The only evidence which it presented in support of that contention was that Mr. Togliatti's name appeared along with that of several hundred other names of Communist leaders in a report which

had been prepared under the auspices of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 264—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 264.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is an issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for August 1, 1948, and direct your attention to an article appearing on Page 1 entitled "Powerful Demonstration of Forces in Democratic Camp," and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.
A. Yes, I have read this article which appears in For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy for August 1, 1948.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the view and attitude of the International Communist movement toward the attempt on the life of Togliatti? A. Yes, it does, in my opinion.

MR. LENVIN: I asked whether or not he had been able to form any opinion on the Italian election of 1948.

6901 - THE WITNESS: Through its official press the Communist Party of the United States expressed frequently its views concerning the election which was held in Italy in March 1948.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 265—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 265.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for June 1948, and specifically direct your attention to an article commencing on page 529 entitled "The Italian Elections," by John Gates, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article which appeared in Political Affairs for June 1948.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Italian Elections of 1948? A. Yes, in my opinion it represents an authoritative and official statement of the views of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Italian elections of 1948.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 266—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 266.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for Thursday, July 15, 1948, and direct your attention to the box appearing at the top of page 3, with the heading "Communist Party Cables Togliatti," and ask you whether you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I read this item in the Daily Worker of July 15, 1948.

Q. In your opinion does that show the attitude or the view of the Communist Party toward this attempted assassination? A. Yes, this is the publication of the official message from the offices of the Communist Party of the United States. In it it is stated as part of the same general item here that this attempted assassination is the fruit of American imperialism's policy of intervention in Italy's affairs.

6904 Q. Dr. Mosely, from your examination of materials and other publications emanating from the Soviet Union and in your general research on the question of

Soviet foreign policy, will you tell us something about the World Congress of Partisans of Peace?

6905 THE WITNESS: The World Congress of Partisans of Peace was organized at the Congress of organizations held in Paris in April 1949, and its organization was further rounded out by an immediately subsequent congress held in Prague. At a meeting of representatives of the different national committees and organizations which joined this Congress held in Stockholm in March 1950 the so-called Stockholm Peace Appeal was drafted and submitted through these organizations to persons in many countries of the world to solicit their signatures. The so-called peace appeal called for an immediate ban upon the use of atomic weapons and declared that any power which first used those weapons would be regarded, under the rule of war, criminals. Through national committees and organizations very large numbers of signatures were collected to this petition.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials emanating from the Soviet Union have you been able to form an opinion as to the attitude and the view of the Soviet Union toward the world peace movement, the partisans of peace and the Stockholm Peace Appeal? A. Yes, I have. The official Soviet spokesmen and representatives of Soviet organizations as well as the Soviet Press gave a great many comments and interpretations of the work of the so-called partisans of peace. The Soviet press stated that since the world was divided into two camps, one of them the Soviet-led camp described as the camp of peace and democracy, and those who supported the so-called Stockholm Peace Appeal or Petition were therefore supporters of the camp for peace and therefore of Soviet foreign policy.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 267, which is the USSR Information Bulletin for July 7, 1950, and direct your attention to the material commencing on page 400 entitled "Supreme Soviet Gives Full Approval to World Peace Congress Appeal," and ask you whether you have read this material before. A. Yes, I have read this material at the time and since. This purports to be the full transcript in English translation of speeches on this subject made in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Mr. ABT: May I see the exhibit just a moment, please.

THE WITNESS: It states the full support of the Soviet Government for the contents of the Appeal. It also claims that only the Soviet Government, governments friendly to the Soviet Union, and those persons who signed the so-called Stockholm appeal are supporters of peace, and those who opposed or criticized the Congress of the so-called Partisans of Peace or who criticized the so-called Stockholm Appeal were therefore enemies of peace and war-mongers.

By Mr. LENVIN:

Q. I would like to call your attention again, Dr. Mosely, to the exhibit which has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 231, which was the issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, for November 11, 1949, which contains a report delivered by G. M. Malenkov at the anniversary meeting of the Moscow Soviet, November 6, 1949, and ask you whether in your opinion this report reflects the views and attitude of the International Communist movement and of the Soviet Union toward the World Congress of Partisans of Peace as of that date.

6908 THE WITNESS: The speech by Mr. Malenkov on November 6, 1949, is in my opinion an authoritative statement of the official Soviet view and view of the Com-

munist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union concerning the world situation as of that general time. In his report Mr. Malenkov gives very strong support to the so-called World Peace Congress and asserts that its aim and those of Soviet policy coincide. He identifies the Soviet Union as the camp of peace and its opponents and critics as the camp of war and aggression. This same theme has been elaborated on very many occasions in the Soviet official press and by Soviet spokesmen.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. Now, Dr. Mosely, I would also like to show you what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 268—

6909 (The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 268.)

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. —headed "Soviet Monitor," issued by Tass Agency, and direct your attention to reprint of a Pravda editorial entitled "The Front of the Struggle for Peace is Broadening," and ask you whether you ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this translation presented by the Tass Agency of the editorial in Pravda.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that editorial reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the so-called peace movement, the World Congress of Partisans of Peace? A. Yes. It expresses complete support of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party Bolshevik of the Soviet Union for the World Peace Congress. It states that this movement is the strongest obstacle to the spread of war and aggression and states that the Soviet people are marching at the head of the camp for peace and democracy. It also places the entire responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities in Korea upon the United States and states that those who support peace also oppose the United States and the United Nations policy and action in Korea.

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been
 6910 able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the World Congress of Partisans of Peace and the Stockholm Peace Appeal? A. Yes, I have. The Communist Press in the United States has commented frequently upon the so-called World Peace Congress or the movement of the Partisans of Peace. It has asserted that it was the duty of the members of the Communist Party and of supporters to strive in every way to make the Stockholm Appeal known and to secure signatures for it in support of the policy of peace. It has at the same time approved the Soviet attitude toward the World Peace Congress. The attitude which it has taken has been directly parallel to that taken by the official Soviet Press and by the organ of the Cominform.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as
 6911 Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 269, which is the Daily Worker for June 9, 1950, and direct your attention to the story commencing on page 1, and ask you whether you ever have read that before. A. Yes, I have read this article in the Daily Worker of June 9, 1950.

Q. In your opinion does that reflect the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States toward the Stockholm Peace Pledge? A. It does. It urges full support by all Americans for the Peace Pledge and urges a campaign to gather five million signatures in support of the specific world peace pledge, which is also reproduced on page 1 of the Daily Worker of this date, June 9, 1950.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as
 Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 270—

(The document referred to was marked for identification
 Petitioner's Exhibit No. 270.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for July 13, 1950, and direct your attention to an article appearing on the 6912 editorial page, entitled "The Peace Movement is America's only Salvation," by Michael Russo, assistant National Organizational Secretary, Communist Party, and ask you whether you have read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article by Mr. Russo.

Q. In your opinion, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the Stockholm Peace Movement as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it does, while Mr. Russo disclaims the intention of speaking for the non-Communist organizations and committees or individuals who have supported the Stockholm Appeal, he does make it clear that he considers that basically signature to the Stockholm Appeal is equivalent to condemning what he describes as the United States attack upon North Korea. In his interpretation and his recommendations he follows very closely the line taken by the official Soviet Press and by the Cominform organ.

Q. It is a matter of historical fact, is it not, Dr. Mosely, that the Western Powers and the Soviet Union signed a treaty of peace with the Italian Government?

6913 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. This treaty was signed approximately on February 15, 1947, and came into force on September 15, 1947.

6915 Q. Dr. Mosely, from your study and research have you been able to form any opinion as to what the Soviet views and attitudes were toward the projected Italian peace treaty some time between the cessation of hostilities in Europe after World War II and the final 6916 signing of the Peace Treaty in 1947? A. Yes, I have.

Q. Will you state what those views and attitudes were? A. Among the principal Soviet demands made in connection

with the negotiation of the treaty were that Trieste and surrounding territory should be transferred to Yugoslavia, that a Soviet trusteeship be established in Tripolitania, that large scale reparations be paid by Italy to the Soviet Union and to certain other states. At an early stage in the negotiation the listing of the points of dispute totaled 179.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 271—

Q. —which is an issue of New Times for May 15, 1946, and direct your attention to an article entitled "The Paris Session of the Council of Foreign Ministers," by A. Sokolov, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

6917 THE WITNESS: Yes, I read the article by A. Sokolov in New Times for May 15, 1946, in Russian, at the time in Paris, in fact in the Palace of Luxembourg where the negotiations of the treaty were going on, and I have reread it in English in this version.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion does this article reflect the Soviet position regarding the negotiations of the Italian Peace Treaty? A. Yes, in my opinion it is a typical expression of the Soviet views on the negotiations of the Italian Peace Treaty as of that time.

Q. In your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the negotiations toward the Italian Peace Treaty? A. Yes, I have. The official press of the Communist Party of the United States commented frequently on these negotiations.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 272—

6918 (The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 272.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —which is the Worker for Sunday, May 19, 1946.

MR. ABT: What is your number?

MR. LENVIN: 120.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. And direct your attention to an article appearing on page 4 entitled "Byrnes' Acts Hearten Axis States," and ask you whether you have ever read that report. A. Yes, I have read this article in the Sunday Worker of, May 19, 1946, page 4. It reviews the negotiations for the Italian Peace Treaty and its interpretation and its recommendations parallel closely those presented by the Soviet Press and by the Soviet official spokesmen, in this case by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Molotov.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, that article reflects the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the then negotiations for an Italian Peace Treaty? A. Yes, in my opinion it is an authoritative statement of the position of the Communist Party of the United States on this question at that time, and it recommends that the United States Government adopt the Soviet position on all points in dispute which we listed here.

6920 Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a historical fact, is it not, that one of the major points of disagreement between the United States and the Soviet Union during certain sessions of the United Nations was on the question of control of atomic energy?

THE WITNESS: It is a historical fact that there has been continuing disagreement over the problem of the owner-

ship, control, and inspection of fissionable materials between the Soviet Union and certain states supporting its position and the majority of the United Nations, including the United States.

By MR. LENVIN:

6921 Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like again to refer to what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 241, which is the USSR Information Bulletin for April 22, 1949.

Q. —and the text of the speech contained therein by Andrei A. Gromyko, entitled "The 'Veto' and the Aggressive North Atlantic Bloc," and ask you whether in your opinion the statement made therein by Mr. Gromyko is a fair statement of the Soviet position on the question of the international control of atomic energy. A. I have read this speech by Mr. Gromyko in the records of the United Nations and also as reproduced in the USSR Information Bulletin under date of April 22, 1949, and in my opinion his interpretation of the whole long debate over the question of control over atomic energy is authoritative and typical exposition of the Soviet point of view.

6922 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the question of the control of atomic energy? A. Yes, I have formed an opinion on the basis of numerous statements issued by the Communist Party of the United States on this question, particularly between July 1946 and the summer of 1949, but also continuing since that time.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 273—

6923 Q. —which is an issue of the Daily Worker for October 12, 1949, and also what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 274—

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for October 13, 1949, and for the issue October 12 I would like to direct your attention to the article by Joseph Starobin, entitled "Soviets Offer A-Bomb Count; Challenge U.S. to do Likewise." And in the issue of October 13, to the column by Joseph Starobin entitled "Around the Globe," and ask you whether you have taken these two articles into account in arriving at your opinion as to the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States towards the question of international control of atomic energy.

THE WITNESS: I have read these two articles. They are typical of the interpretation given to this problem by 6924 the Communist Party of the United States through its official publications, and they support in every particular the Soviet proposals concerning control and inspection of atomic energy. Such expressions of opinion and such interpretation are found constantly throughout these past five years in the official press of the Communist Party of the United States, and they directly parallel the proposals and augmentation advanced by the Soviet Government in this matter.

Q. It is also a matter of historical fact, is it not, Dr. Mosely, that another matter of disagreement that arose between the United States and the Soviet Union in the United Nations was on the question of whether the representatives of the People's Republic of China should be seated as representatives of that country rather than the present Nationalist Government delegates?

THE WITNESS: This question has been a matter of dispute in the United Nations since roughly October 1949, 6925 and on this question the Soviet Government and the United States Government have taken opposite points of view.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. From your examination of the material and publications emanating from the Soviet Union and from your examination of the debates in the Security Council have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward this question of the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China?

A. From the time when the Soviet Government recognized the so-called People's Democratic Republic of China at the beginning of October 1949 as the Government of all of China and therefore qualified to represent China in the community of nations, it has pressed for the seating of the representatives of the Chinese Democratic People's Republic as the representatives of China in all international gatherings and bodies, including the United Nations and its various organs.

It has at the same time pressed for the exclusion of the representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government from those conferences, meetings and international bodies.

6926 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 275, Security Council Official Records, Fifth Year, 461st Meeting, 13 January 1950, and direct your attention to pages 1 to 18, and ask you whether you have ever read this before.

A. Yes, I have read the minutes of this meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations, the 461st meeting, January 13, 1950.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, is that material to which I have just directed your attention illustrative of the

6927 views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the question of the seating of the delegates from the People's Republic of China? A. Yes. The section of these minutes which reports the speech of the representative of the Soviet Union on this question is a speech by the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the most important international organization, and it is to my mind an authoritative summary of the Soviet view on the question of which Government in China should fill the seat assigned to China in the Security Council and in other organs of the United Nations. May I point out that the resolution to which the discussion was directed at that session had been presented at the 459th meeting on January 10, 1950, as Security Council Resolution 1443, and therefore the text is not in these minutes.

MR. ABT: Mr. Chairman, as I read this exhibit it is minutes of the Security Council, which contain a debate in which first the Ecuadorian representative starts off and then the representatives of a number of the other countries, and Malik's statement occupies only a portion of pages 910, a very brief statement. Then starting on page 16 the Council takes up an entirely different question, regulation and production of armaments and armed forces.

6928 Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other material issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that party toward the question of the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations? A. Yes, I have, on the basis of frequent comments and recommendations made by the official spokesmen and official press of the Communist Party in the United States, especially from the beginning of October 1949, when the Government of the People's Republic of China received recognition from the Soviet Government.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 276—

6929 Q. —which is the Daily Worker for November 24, 1950, and direct your attention to the article on the editorial page entitled "People's China should be Seated in the UN," by William Z. Foster, and ask you if you have ever read that before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article by Mr. Foster.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. And in your opinion is that article typical of the statements which you have read indicating the attitude and views of the Communist Party of the United States toward the question of the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China? A. Yes. This is a typical expression of views giving an interpretation and a series of recommendations which are consistent with the frequently repeated expressions of views of the Party. Its recommendations and interpretations are directly parallel with those advanced by Soviet spokesmen and by the Soviet Press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, it is a matter of historical fact, also, is it not, that another matter of dispute between the United States and the Soviet Union related to the election of Yugoslavia as a non-permanent member of the Security Council in 1949? A. It is a fact. This issue was before the United Nations for approximately five weeks and was the occasion of many speeches in the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is a fact that opposite points of view on this question, the election of Yugoslavia or the election of Czechoslovakia to a non-permanent seat for the year 1950, was sharply discussed between the representatives of the Soviet and United States Governments.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Are you abandoning M-124, interview with Josef Stalin, Pravda correspondent, and so forth?

MR. LENVIN: Yes.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 277—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 277.)

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. —summary minutes of the 231st plenary meeting of the UN Security Council, particularly pages 102 and 103, and ask you whether you have ever read these summary minutes. A. Yes, I read these summary minutes in mimeographed form a few days after the date of the meeting, which was October 20, 1949, and I have also read them in the final printed form.

6930 Q. Have you also read them in the Russian Press?

A. Yes, I have read a similar summary printed in Izvestia for October 22, 1949. The Soviet summary has very minor verbal differences, none of them substantial, as compared with the summary minutes as published by the official reporter of the United Nations.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, do these summary minutes reflect the views and attitude of the Soviet Union toward the question of the election of Yugoslavia as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council in 1949? A. Yes, they represent the statement of the official spokesman of the Soviet Union on this question.

Q. I now want to show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibits for identification 278, 279 and 280; 278 being the issue of the Daily Worker for October 19, 1949, and direct your attention to the article appearing on page 3 by Robert Friedman, entitled "USSR Won't Accept Tito on UN Council, Vishinsky Warns." Then I would like to direct your attention to Petitioner's Exhibit 279, a column by Joseph Starobin, "The Election

in UN a Test of Sincerity," in the Daily Worker for October 20, 1949, page 8—

Q. Then Petitioner's Exhibit 280, Daily Worker, Friday, October 21, 1949, article, "U.S. Forces UN Election of Yugoslavia."

6932 Q. I ask you, Dr. Mosely, whether in arriving at your opinion as to the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the question of Yugoslavia as a non-permanent member of the Security Council in 1949 you took those three items into account. A. Yes, I did, among others. These three items in my opinion represent typical interpretations of this problem and typical recommendations concerning it by the Communist Party of the United States, and they are directly in support of and parallel to the position taken by the Soviet representatives on this problem and at that time.

Q. Dr. Mosely, will you describe briefly the political situation in Korea following the cessation of hostilities in Asia and prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea?

6933 THE WITNESS: In the final stage of the Japanese surrender it was agreed that Soviet troops should receive the surrender of Japanese forces in the area of Korea north of the 38th Parallel and that the forces of the allied powers in the Pacific, and particularly United States forces, would receive the surrender of Japanese forces in Korea South of the 38th Parallel. The first real attempt to overcome the results of this division—

THE WITNESS: —was the agreement made at the conference of three foreign ministers at Moscow in December 1945. The carrying out of the arrangements for establishing a

coordinated policy in the two zones and for establishing a provisional government over all of Korea broke down. The Soviet and United States representatives in Korea did not agree. A further effort was made in April and May 1947 during the Moscow meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, and this was expressed in an exchange of letters between Secretary of State Marshall and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Molotov. Again the representatives of the two powers in Korea were unable to agree on the implementation of this agreement.

The issue was then brought before the United Nations by the United States, and the General Assembly adopted resolutions and recommendations which were rejected by the Soviet Union.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What is the date of that last event?

THE WITNESS: The General Assembly is able to 6934 make the recommendations not binding--

MR. LAFOLLETTE: What date?

THE WITNESS: Pardon me. Those recommendations were adopted approximately in November 1947.

The General Assembly of the United Nations established a commission on Korea again in an effort to overcome the division. The Soviet Government declined to be represented on this Commission, and the Government established in North Korea refused to admit the United Nations Commission to its territory or to recognize it in any way.

In the following two years, by 1949, a government had been established in North Korea and a government had been established in South Korea. In June of 1950 the forces of North Korea advanced into the territory of South Korea—

MR. MARCANTONIO: I object and move to strike.

THE WITNESS: I haven't completed the sentence.

MR. LENVIN: Just one minute.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Overruled.

MR. ABT: Are we going to get into the question of who fired the first shot in Korea, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Proceed.

THE WITNESS: If I may complete that sentence: According to the findings of the United Nations Commission on Korea, which was in South Korea at the time and had 6935 personnel and observers in the area. Since that time the armed struggle has continued in Korea.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 281—

Q. —which is the Security Council official records, Fourth Year, 423rd Meeting, April 8, 1949, and direct your attention to a speech by Mr. Malik commencing on page 2 and ask you if you have ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read the minutes of the Security Council, 423rd meeting, April 8, 1949, including the text of the remarks by Mr. Malik, the representative of the Soviet Government.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that speech reflect the attitude and views of the Soviet Union both toward the records of North and South Korea as of that date?

THE WITNESS: In my opinion this statement reflects the Soviet interpretation of the events and conditions in 6936 both North and South Korea at that time, and similar interpretations and recommendations of policy were frequently made by the Soviet Government through its spokesmen and through the official press.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 282—

Q. —supplement to New Times, July 12, 1950, and direct your attention to a statement by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, A. A. Gromyko—

Q. —on the American armed intervention in Korea and ask you whether you have ever read that report. A. Yes, I read extensive excerpts from this statement by Mr. Gromyko on the following day in the American press, and a few days later I read the entire text in Russian in the Soviet press, and I have read this English version which was issued as a supplement to New Times, an authoritative Soviet magazine dealing with foreign affairs. This 6937 is in my opinion a detailed and authoritative statement of the Soviet view of the situation in Korea as of the time when Mr. Gromyko spoke.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, the issue of New Times for November 15, 1950, which is M-128—

Q. Have you read that article before, Dr. Mosely? A. Yes, I have read the article entitled "In Defense of Korea," in New Times No. 46 for 1950.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article fairly reflect the view of the Soviet Union toward the situation in Korea as of that date? A. In my opinion this statement reflects the Soviet view of the situation in Korea as of that time and also the Soviet view of the attitude of the Chinese People's Republic toward the situation in Korea.

THE WITNESS: This declaration quotes with approval 6938 the assertion of the China Peace Committee that the United States Aggression in Korea was to be extended as aggression against China, and that to assist Korea was simply to protect China.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. Dr. Mosely, in your examination of the publications and other materials which have been issued by the Communist Party of the United States, have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party

toward the Government of North Korea prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and to the views and attitude of that Party toward the participants in the hostilities in Korea? A. Yes, I have. Through its frequent pronouncements, appeals, and official statements, and through its official press, the Communist Party in the United States has repeatedly expressed its opinions, its interpretations and its recommendations of policy concerning the hostilities in Korea and has expressed its full support for the Government of North Korea and support of the position taken by Soviet policy during this struggle, as well as its approval of the participation of forces coming from China proper, and taking part in the struggle in Korea itself. In taking these positions the official press of the Communist Party in the United States has followed a line closely parallel to the position taken by the Soviet Government and the Soviet press.

6939 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 284 for identification—

Q. —and direct your attention to an editorial entitled "Wall Street's War Against the Korean People," by Betty Gannett, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article, which appeared in Political Affairs for August 1950, entitled "Wall Street's War Against the Korean People," subtitle: "An Editorial Article."

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect the views and attitude of the Communist Party toward the situation in Korea as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion it is an authoritative statement of the point of view and recommendations of policy of the Communist Party of the United States concerning the situation of that general time.

in Korea. It supports the position taken by the Soviet
6940 Government in dealing with that question within the
United Nations and outside.

Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked
as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 285—

Q. —the Sunday Worker for September 24, 1950, and
direct your attention to an editorial entitled "The Message
of Bombs," and ask you whether you have ever read that
before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read this article which ap-
peared in the Sunday Worker for September 24, 1950;
page 5.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, is that editorial illustra-
tive of the views and attitude of the Communist Party of
the United States toward the situation in Korea on that
date? A. Yes, in my opinion it is typical of the interpreta-
tions and recommendations presented by the official press
of the Communist Party in the United States and is in close
parallel to the expressions of the Soviet Press on that same
problem at that general time.

6941 Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked
as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 286—

Q. —which is an issue of Political Affairs for February
1949, and direct your attention to an article "The Peace
Can Be Won," by Joseph Clark, and ask you if you have
ever read that before. A. Yes, I have read this article by
Mr. Clark at the time and since.

Q. In your opinion, noting especially the material on
pages 21 and 22, does that article reflect the view of the
Communist Party towards Korea as of that date?

6942 THE WITNESS: Yes, in my opinion Mr. Clark's analysis of the Korean situation is a typical example of the presentation made during that same general period by the Communist Party of the United States through its official publications and is directly parallel to the analysis presented in the Soviet official press.

.

Q. Dr. Mosely, do you recall approximately the date when it was announced or publication was made in the press of the United States concerning the intervention of the Chinese forces in the Korean conflict? Or the entrance. I won't use the word "intervention," the entrance of the Chinese forces into the Korean conflict? A. Chinese Communist forces were first reported in combat in Korea during the last ten days of November 1950, approximately November 25.

.

6943 Q. Dr. Mosely, I show you what has been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 287—

.

Q. —which is the issue of the Daily Worker for June 26, 1950, and direct your attention to the editorial on page 1.

.

Q. Have you read that editorial before? A. I have read this editorial on page 1 of the Daily Worker, June 26, 1950.

Q. In your opinion does that editorial reflect the view of the Communist Party toward the Korea situation as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this is a typical expression of the interpretation of events in Korea as presented by the Communist Party of the United States, and it parallels very closely the interpretations published by the official Soviet Press.

6944 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 288—

.

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for June 27, 1950, and direct your attention to the editorial headed "Dulles-Triggerman Who Started War in Korea," and ask you whether you ever read that before.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read the editorial in the Daily Worker of June 27, 1950, page 1 and 2.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your opinion does that editorial reflect the view of the Communist Party toward the situation in Korea as of that date? A. Yes, in my opinion this is a typical statement of the position taken officially by the Communist Party of the United States on this question as of that time, and it is directly parallel to the interpretation published by the Soviet official press and by the official organ of the Cominform.

6945 Q. I also show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 289—

Q. —which is also from the Daily Worker for June 27, 1950, and I would like to direct your attention to the article entitled "Truman Maps Use of Army in Korea; Liberation Forces at Gates of Seoul," by Rob F. Hall, and ask you if you have read that before.

Q. Confine it to the "Truman Maps Use of Army in Korea," story.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have read the signed news dispatch by Mr. Rob F. Hall and published in the Daily Worker of June 29, 1950, pages 3 and 9.

By MR. LENVIN :

Q. Dr. Mosely, on the date mentioned previously when it was announced in the Press of the United States that the Chinese forces had entered Korea, have you from 6946 your examinations of materials and publications emanating from the Soviet Union been able to arrive at any opinion as to what the views and attitudes of the Soviet Union were toward the entrance of the Chinese forces into the war in Korea? A. Yes, I have, on the basis of official Soviet statements and the constant stream of comments by the official Soviet press.

Q. Dr. Mosely, I would like again to direct your attention to what has already been marked for identification as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 283, which is the New Times, No. 46, 1950, which contains the article "In defense of Korea" and ask you whether in your opinion that article reflects the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the entrance of the Chinese forces into the armed conflict in Korea.

6947 THE WITNESS: Yes, in my opinion this article entitled "In defense of Korea," in New Times, No. 46 for 1950, expresses strong Soviet approval of the urgings put forward by committees and other organizations in Communist China urging that China should defend itself in Korea against what it declared was the American intention to commit aggression against China itself. It declared that the Chinese volunteers, so called, in coming to the aid of the Korean people, were following a glorious tradition. It stated that this movement on the part of important elements in China, which it did not identify at that time as the Government of the so-called People's Democratic Republic of China, would be assisted by the committee in defense of world peace. It quoted with approval Chinese statements that helping Korea, meaning by that North Korea, was in China's own interest and was necessitated by the requirements of self-defense.

By MR. LENVIN:

Q. In your examination of the publications and other materials issued by the Communist Party of the United States have you been able to form any opinion as to the views and attitude of that Party toward the entrance of the Chinese forces into the Korean conflict? A. Yes, I have. The official press of the Communist Party of the United States commented frequently and made urgent
6948 recommendations of policy in connection with the action of Chinese forces in Korea.

Q. I show you, Dr. Mosely, what has been marked as Petitioner's Exhibit for identification No. 290—

(The document referred to has been marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 290.)

Q. —which is the Daily Worker for Friday, November 17, 1950, and specifically direct your attention to an article entitled "Wall Street's aggression in China," by William Z. Foster, and ask you whether you have ever read that article before. A. Yes, I have read this article by Mr. Foster in the Daily Worker for November 17, 1950.

Q. In your opinion, Dr. Mosely, does that article reflect or is that article illustrative of the views of the Communist Party toward the matter of the entrance of the Chinese into the armed conflict in Korea? A. In my opinion this is a typical statement of the interpretation given to events and prospects in that part of the world by the Communist Party in the United States. It accused the Government of the United States of intending to conquer China proper. It stated it is determined to push its campaign of imperialist conquest into China proper. It accused the United States
6949 of treating the hostilities in Korea as a springboard for the conquest of China. This, I might note, was published prior to the first overt military action of the Chinese forces in Korea and it paralleled exactly the accusations which were being spread by the Soviet Press at that time, as well as by the Cominform Press.

6963 **Manning Johnson** called as a witness on behalf of Petitioner, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PAISLEY:

6975 Q. Do you know whether or not any minutes were kept of the meetings of the Central Committee when you were serving on it? A. Yes, complete records of the meetings of the Central Committee were kept. In fact, they had a number of stenographers who took down in shorthand everything that was said by all of the speakers during the entire meeting of the Central Committee. They had typewriters in the anteroom where the stenographers transcribed their shorthand and typed up the individual remarks of the speakers.

Q. The members receive copies of the minutes? A. Yes. Each member was given a copy only of what he said at the Central Committee meeting for the purpose of correcting any mistakes or making any additions to his remarks that he could not get in because of time limitations. He was not permitted to keep those minutes. He had to turn them in.

Q. Do you know what distribution was made of the minutes? A. The minutes of the Central Committee, like the minutes of all committees of the Party, are typed out in copies of five on onion skin paper—

MR. ABT: Copies with what?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Copies of five on onion skin paper.

THE WITNESS: —on onion skin paper, and copies of the minutes are sent to Soviet Russia—

BY MR. PAISLEY:

6978 Q. Mr. Johnson, how do you know that the minutes of the Central Committee went to Soviet Russia? A. I know from instructions that I received in the National Training School of the Communist Party and, sec-

6979 ondy; what I was told by the leaders of the National Committee and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party with regard to the procedure and handling of minutes. This was necessary because we were told that our advancement in the Communist Party depended upon the reflection of our work in the reports that were sent to Soviet Russia and that no positions of leadership in the Party held by any individual member could be held without the approval of the Communist International in Moscow.

* * * * *

6981 Q. I believe you joined the Party at Buffalo? A. I did, in Buffalo, New York.

Q. How long did you remain there? A. From 1930 up until 1934, about the middle of 1934.

Q. Then what did you do? A. I was transferred by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee to the city of New York.

6982 Q. Did you go to school somewhere? A. I went to the National Training School of the Communist Party in the City of New York in 1932.

* * * * *

6988 Q. You were telling us about some of the instructors. Will you now continue? A. J. Peters was one of our instructors. He taught us with regard to the illegal and underground apparatus of the Party and how it functions and how it operates. We had Jack Stachel or Jacob Stachel, who taught us on trade unionism. We had a lecture, too, by William Z. Foster. We had B. D. Amis, who gave us lectures on the Negro question; Max Bedacht on fraternal organizations, language groups; lectures by Fred

6989 Brown, alias Alpi, Gilbert Green on the YCL, Communist work and activities among the American youth. We had some lectures by Rose Wortis. A. Moreau lectured to us on Communist infiltration of the Latin American countries.

* * * * *

6990 Q. Did any of the teachers, leaders or instructors tell you why you were there? A. We were told by Abe Markoff at the time that the school opened in an indoctrination lecture that we were being trained to be professional revolutionists in the strictest sense of the word, that at the completion of our course we would become professional revolutionists, devoting our entire lives to the revolutionary cause, bringing about the Soviet form of Government in the United States and throughout the world.

Q. Just what were you told as to the aims and purposes of the Communist movement in this country? A. We were taught that the aims and objectives of the Communist Party in the United States is the overthrow of the Government of the United States and the establishment of the Soviet form of Government similar to the one that is in Russia at the present time.

Q. What, if anything, were you told about the position of Soviet Russia and the Communist Party of Soviet Russia in the world communist movement?

6991 THE WITNESS: We were taught that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the leading Party in world organization of Communism, that is, the Communist International; that the Communist Party of Soviet Russia, by virtue of the fact that it was the first Communist Party to achieve success in the overthrow of the capitalist, feudalistic government in Russia, were the indisputable leaders of the world Communist movement; that the Communist Party of Soviet Russia, under the leadership of V. I. Lenin, formed the Communist International, that is, the Communist Party of Soviet Russia formed Communist parties in countries throughout the world to work under the guidance, the leadership, and the control of the Communist Party of Russia to effect and bring about revolutions in every country throughout the world for the purpose of forming a world union of Socialist Soviet Republics, of which the USSR, that is, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is the prototype.

6997 Q. On the subject of allegiance by Communist Party leaders, were you taught anything at this school that you attended on that subject? A. Yes, we were. We were taught that Soviet Russia is our fatherland, that is, it is the fatherland of all Communists, and that we do not owe allegiance to Washington but to Moscow.

Q. Was anything taught you about the duty of Communist Party members in the United States in the event of war between the United States and the Soviet Union?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we were. We were taught that in the event of war between the United States and Soviet Russia it was the duty of every Communist to bring about the defeat of the Government of the United States and to secure the victory of the Soviet Red Army. In this connection we were given as reading material the article by a former member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party by the name of Wicks. We were told to read this particular article which was published in The Communist in the latter part of the 20's because it set forth clearly and succinctly the line of the Communist Party with regard to war between the Government of the United States and Soviet Russia. In addition to that, of course, it covered the general attitude of the Communists toward war.

MR. PAISLEY: I show you what has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit 292, which is an issue of The Communist, July 1929, the first article of which is an article by H. M. Wicks. I hand you one of the original issues of The Communist for that month. Do you recognize the Wicks article?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

Q. That Wicks offer deals with this subject, does it not? A. It does. It deals specifically with regard to what each Communist must do in the event such a war broke out.

6999 MR. LAFOLLETTE: The objection is overruled, and the document may be received as Petitioner's Exhibit No. 292.

Q. I notice that this article deals with the position of the Communist Party in the matter of strikes in this country also. Will you tell the Board briefly what students were taught in that school concerning the policy of the Communist Party as to strikes in industry in this country. A. Yes. We were taught that it was important for the Communist Party to sink its roots deep in the basic and key industries of the nation, particularly railroads, steel, mining, communications, transportation generally, 7000 including the maritime, the automobile industry, the aircraft and chemical industries, et cetera, for the purpose of placing the Party in a position through its anti-war committees formed in these industries to cripple and paralyze these industries in the event of war, that even if these strikes were crushed by the Government, the disruption or delay would objectively support the Soviet Government and its war machine.

Q. What if the demands of the workers in the particular industry were met in the strike, were you given any instructions as to what the attitude should be of the Communists? A. Our attitude was that we would call strikes ostensibly around the issue of wages, hours, and working conditions, but our objective would not be limited by the making of economic demands. Our objective would be a political objective. But in order to involve the majority of the workers in a given action that had as its objective the crippling of the war machine of the Government of the United States, such tactics and methods of drawing the workers into a given strike or stoppage, et cetera, were to be used by the Party. In other words, while we generally agitate the workers on the issue of opposition to the war, at the same time we tie them up with the basic economic grievances of the workers, raising such demands that we

know the management of a given industry would refuse to grant, and that would bring about a prolonged 7001 conflict between management and the employees; in the course of that, constantly to hammer away on the issue of defense of the Soviet Union and opposition to Wall Street and Wall Street's Government of war-mongers.

Q. You were in this school in the depths of the depression, were you not, about 1932? A. That is right.

Q. Was anything taught at that school concerning the functioning of Communists in the event of a revolutionary movement in this country? A. Yes. We were taught at that time that it was our duty to take full advantage of the present, that is, the then crisis of capitalism in America, to rally the masses of the workers for its revolutionary overthrow. It was explained to us at the time, further, that it would be impossible for us during that crisis to overthrow the government of the United States because of the Communist Party's weak contacts with the masses, that all we could hope to do was to exploit the crisis at that time to the utmost to build the Party and to strengthen the party's ties and connections with the workers, the farmers, and the Negro people and the foreign-born of this nation. They also stated that it would be precisely during a far-reaching and deep-going crisis of the nature that we went through at that particular time that would afford the opportunity for the Communists if they were fully prepared to use the issue of the crisis to bring about a critical 7002 political situation in so far as the American Government was concerned and to strike out for political power.

Q. Was this question of possible revolution in this country the subject of lectures in this school? A. Yes. The subject of revolutions was the subject of discussion in the school.

Q. Was the role of the Red Army ever mentioned in that possible situation? A. Yes, it was mentioned. It was mentioned in this respect, that because of the tremendous strength of American capitalism, it might be extremely

difficult, if not impossible for the Communist Party to overthrow the Government of the United States of itself but that it was the duty of the Communists to build themselves up to that position where they could challenge the power of Wall Street and this Government, and that the Red Army would not hesitate to throw its weight into the scales to tip the scales of the conflict in favor of the Communist revolutionists in America. That was one phase. The other phase was that in the midst of World War, when masses of the workers have arms in their possession, the Communist cells in the Armed Forces, that is, in the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, et cetera, would agitate and work for the demoralization of the Armed Forces of the Government of the United States, to urge them and convince them to refuse to fight against the Soviet 7003 Red Army and go over on the side of the Red Army and use their guns against the Government of the United States and all of the forces that remained loyal to it.

Q. After you were indoctrinated in the manner that you have just testified, did you later on teach yourself? A. In lectures, speeches, yes. What I learned in that school was the policy of the Party throughout the time that I was there. It was further developed and elaborated upon by the leaders of the Party, such as William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Max Bedacht, Alexander Bittelman, Jack Stachel, and others at meetings of the National Committee and at conventions of the Party when there was discussion of the general world situation and the question of peace or war. This was in connection also with the work of the various so-called peace organizations of the Party, like the—

7006 Q. Just in general, what were you taught on the subject?

MR. LAFOLLETTE: At the national training school.

MR. PAISLEY: Yes.

THE WITNESS: At the national training school we were taught that the Negro people in America constitute a na-

tional minority in the same sense that various national and racial groups in Soviet Russia were considered by Lenin as national minorities, and as a national minority they were entitled to the right of self-determination. The right of self-determination pre-supposes that a racial group is a national minority in accordance with the definition of a nation as set forth by V. I. Lenin, that is, that they must have a common language, common territory, and historic traditions reflecting themselves in a common culture, et cetera. This definition, according to the instructions we received, applied to the Negroes in America. Their common territory was considered the black belt in the South, that is, the old cotton belt, which begins on the eastern shore of Maryland and extends for about 219 or more counties, through nine states, driving a wedge into Texas. In addition to this being the common territory, they considered English the common language, and its common culture is reflected in the Negro spirituals, Negro literature, Negro art, and so forth and so on. Its common economic ties are reflected in the general economy that prevails in the black belt, the share cropping system, the plantation system that prevails. That they, as a result of having all of these things which Lenin pointed out are the things that are necessary to characterize a racial group, they were entitled to the right of self-determination. By the right of self-determination, it was explained to us, the Negroes there have a right to rebel against the constituted authority in that particular area and to unite that vast area into a single political unit, an autonomous or independent state or government. That is as far as the black belt is concerned.

7008 Generally we were to work for equal rights for

Negroes throughout all parts of the United States. "Equal rights," they taught us, expressed almost all of the desires and aspirations of the Negroes generally, but specifically for the black belt it was rebellion and civil war to form an independent and autonomous Soviet Republic. That this movement toward the establishment of this autonomous Negro Republic should be guided and steered in such

a way by the Negro Communists activity in the movement so that it would take place simultaneous with the general proletariat or Communist revolution in America.

MR. PAISLEY: I have just one more question on that subject.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. You say you lectured on this subject in other schools. Did you teach the same thing? A. Yes, I did. I not only taught it in lectures at the school and in lectures before Party membership and study groups in the Party, but also in speeches that I delivered from time to time in various cities.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Who taught this course at the national training school?

THE WITNESS: We had as our instructor at that time a Negro member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party by the name of B. D. Amis. We used as subject matter the Theses and Resolutions of the Sixth 7009 World Congress, the 13th Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and articles written by Harry Haywood, who was a member of the Central Committee and member of the Political Bureau, by James Allen, and also some articles written by B. D. Amis and James W. Ford. James W. Ford was Communist Candidate for Vice President of the United States. He was also a member of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party.

7012 Q. Did any CI representatives ever come out to your district?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I had a Communist International representative in my district while I was district organizer.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Do you know his name? A. Yes. Gerhard Eisler was in my district when I was district organizer.

7021 Q. I said prior to this convention in 1936 when you were elected to the Central Committee, had you met Gerhard Eisler? A. Yes, I had.

Q. Did he attend that convention? A. I don't think he was at the 1936 convention. I am not sure. About that time he left the country for Spain.

7022 THE WITNESS: The selection of persons for membership on the National Committee is based upon an old established procedure in the Communist Party as set forth in the constitution and by-laws of the Communist International. No person can hold any leading position in the Communist Party without the approval of the Communist International, and no person can resign from that position of leadership in the Party without the approval of the Communist International. So any position of leadership that a person holds in the Communist Party is a gift of the Party, and that position belongs to the Party and not to the individual.

7040 Q. I will go to the subject of the Daily Worker. Were you ever in the offices of the Daily Worker? A. Yes, I was.

Q. Where was that office? A. The Daily Worker office was in the Communist Party building at 50 East 13th Street.

Q. What opportunity, if any, did you have to learn of its policies and how it operates? A. The manager of the Daily Worker was either a member of the National Committee—

7041 THE WITNESS: Yes. I was stating that the editor of the Daily Worker was either a member of the

Central Committee or the National Committee of the Communist Party and he was invited to the meetings of the National Committee of the Communist Party and the Political Bureau, and at meetings of the National Committee and the Political Bureau reports and discussions on the reports with regard to the Daily Worker were given with regard to its policy, its activities, the raising of finances and so forth and so on, for its support.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Do you know how it was financed? A. The Daily Worker ran financial drives from time to time. The Daily Worker also sold subscriptions, six months, a year, and week-end editions. In addition to that the expenses of operation were cut down by the supplying of international news to the Daily Worker through what was known as the International press correspondents, or the Imprecord. The Imprecord was somewhat like the Associate Press and the International Press. The Imprecord was a Communist controlled press service that supplied the Daily Worker constantly with news of what was transpiring throughout the world.

Q. What authority, if any, did the Executive Committee or Central Committee of the Communist Party
7042 undertake to exercise over the Daily Worker, and its editorial policies? A. The Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the Communist Party had absolute control over the editorial policy of the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker editor and other associated editors submitted their copy to the Political Bureau and Central Committee representatives, who went over it and discussed the policy to make sure that it carried and reflected the line and policy of the Communist Party.

7048 Q. Do you recall any conversation with any party leader as to the extent to which students were sent over there? A. From conversations with Markoff, Peters,

Stachel, Browder and others, there were approximately several hundred from 1928 up until 1935 or '36, who had gone over to the Lenin Institute and other schools of higher learning in Russia.

Q. Did the subject ever come up while you were attending any meeting of the Political Bureau? A. Yes, it did come up. Abraham Markoff, who was responsible to the Central Committee of the Communist Party for the training of Communist Party leaders, the training of professional revolutionists, would give from time to time a report to the Central or National Committee meeting with regard to how many communists had been trained for leadership in the section, district, regional, national, and international schools. Later on these reports were given by Mendel, who was placed in charge of the educational work and activities of the Party after the death of Abraham Markoff.

Q. Can you give the Board the names of any students that you know who attended that school? A. Yes, I can.

7049 Q. Give us the names of any individuals that you know who went over there and studied at that school.

7050 A. Harry Haywood, a member of the national Committee and Political Bureau, an authority and theoretician on the Negro question in America; Otto Hall, also a Negro; Odell Newell; Charles White; Leonard Patterson; Timothy Holmes; Steve Nelson; William L. Patterson; Rudy Baker; Hutch Hutchison; Albert Steel; Wilbert Parkhill—

Q. When you were on the Central Committee, what contact, if any, was maintained between the American Communist Party and Soviet Russia? A. When I was a member of the Central Committee the contact was maintained through the representative of the Communist International and through the transmission of minutes of all committee meetings both in the higher and the lower echelons of leadership. This was transmitted through the resident

OGPU agent, who in turn was responsible for the transmission of these minutes to Moscow.

7052 Q. When you were on the Central Committee did the Communist Party in this country maintain a representative at the Communist International over in Moscow?

A. They had representatives of the American Party on the Communist International. William Z. Foster was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and also a member of the Presidium of the Communist International. Earl Browder was also a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Gilbert Green was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and he was also a member of the Secretariat of the YCI, the Young Communist International, which also had headquarters in Moscow, and it is the youth section of the World Communist Movement. Alexander Bittelman was for a time on the Executive Committee of the Communist International. In addition to these representatives of the American Party serving on the Executive Committee and the Presidium of the Communist International, of course we had leaders of the Party who worked in both the Comintern and the Profintern. The Comintern is short for Communist International, and Profintern is short for the Red

7053 International Labor Unions. There were representatives of the American Party on both of these groups.

Q. As to representatives of the Communist International over in this country, do you have any knowledge as to whether or not the Communist International maintained any representatives in this country? A. Yes. The Communist International maintains representatives in this country and in all countries where there exists a Communist Party.

7054 Q. Was there more than one type of Communist International Representative? A. Yes, there were different types of Communist representatives.

Q. How many? A. There was the Communist International representative. That is one. Then they had the Com-

munist International technical representatives. They were individuals who were specially trained and skilled in specific phases of the Communist Work and Communist activities. The third type was the resident OGPU agents or Soviet secret police agents.

7063 Q. Will you tell us just what authority the different types had and exercised?

7068 THE WITNESS: The speeches of Stalin were published in a pamphlet, and this pamphlet deals concretely with this specific situation in the American Party in relation to Pepper.

In connection with the discussion in the school we were told that the authority and the power of the Communist International representatives supersedes that of any leader in the American Party, that they are the direct representatives of the Communist International, that they are not permitted to take sides or play favorites as far as the leaders are concerned, that their responsibility is to see to it that the Moscow Party line is carried out by the American Party.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Who taught this course?

THE WITNESS: J. Peters lectured on that, and also Abe Markoff.

The Communist International representative is the complete boss over the policy of the Communist Party of the United States.

7069 In 1933 when I was district organizer in the Buffalo District, I met Gerhard Eisler. Gerhard Eisler at that time was introduced to me under the name of Brown. Later, at a meeting of the National Committee, I met him. At that time he was using the alias of Edwards. Gerhard Eisler was a representative of the Communist International to the American Party.

THE WITNESS: He spoke at meetings of the National Committee of the Communist Party. His word was law.

THE WITNESS: It was shortly after my meeting with Gerhard Eisler in Buffalo and at subsequent meetings that he attended in New York that I came to the knowledge of his position and standing in the American Party.

7073 Q. How many times did you see this man, approximately? A. The first time I saw him was in 1933, and
7074 subsequently I should say altogether I saw him at a number of meetings.

Q. What kind of meetings? A. Meetings of the National Committee of the Communist Party in 1933, 1934, and part of 1935.

7082 Q. When was the last time you saw him? A. The last time I saw Gerhard Eisler, that is personally, I saw him at the trial in Washington in 1947.

7083 Q. When you were district organizer will you tell us whether any records of membership were kept and if so, how they were kept?

THE WITNESS: We kept the membership records
7084 in a secret place. We used the home of a person that was either a secret member of the Party or a very close sympathizer, who never attended meetings, who was not known except to a very few people in the top as being a party member, who was instructed never to keep any Communist Party literature or anything of that nature around the house. In other words, that particular person that was used to secrete that material was a person that one would not in the least suspect of being identified with the Communist Party.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Were those records open to inspection by any one who might want to see them? A. The records were not open to inspection by anyone except the District Organizer or a representative of the Political Bureau so designated that authority by the Political Bureau of the Communist Party.

Q. During your membership in the Party was there any policy with reference to whether or not a member of the Party could admit his membership?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The Party policy was that no member was permitted to publicly reveal his membership in the Party without the authorization of the leadership of the Party.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Where did you learn this?

7085 THE WITNESS: I learned that when I first became a member, and secondly when I was a student at the National Training School where it was further developed and elaborated upon. That was told me in connection with the advice of the Party leaders at that time that instead of using my real name I should use an alias.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Did you use an alias?

THE WITNESS: No, I did not use an alias. I said at the time I preferred to use my own name in preference to an alias. They told me that the purpose of the use of the alias was to protect me in case the place where I was staying was raided by the police and my Party membership book was found, it would not be made out in my name but would be made out in another name, and I could always explain to the police or any other law enforcement agency that someone who lived there formerly left it or I had found it or some other such excuse. In that way the burden of proof of that book being my personal Party membership book would rest upon the government.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. Did you know others who used aliases? A. Yes, I do.

Q. About these minutes, to which counsel made an objection a moment ago, were they open to inspection by anyone? A. No. The minutes of the Committees of the Party that were put in the secret files were not available
7086 or open to inspection by anyone except myself, and as I said before, representatives so designated by the political bureau to inspect them.

7087 Q. Have you ever received any instructions as to what methods and tactics the Party would adopt in the event the Party decided to go underground?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

Q. Will you explain to the Board what the instructions were and what you did about it, if anything?

THE WITNESS: The first instructions that I received on
7088 the illegal apparatus and the illegal operation of that apparatus was when I read the mimeographed confidential document written by Lazar Kaganovich, member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. That pamphlet went into detail explaining the structure of the apparatus. It dealt with the establishment of a parallel apparatus similar to the open apparatus; that is, an underground Central Committee, political bureau, underground departments of the central committee, underground district committees, underground section committees. That was number one. Number two, the division of the Communist nuclei into smaller organizations called cells, these cells to be limited to not more than five members, with one of the members selected as captain of the cell, the captain of the cell to be responsible for the calling of meetings, the arranging of meetings and directing all of the affairs of the cell, keeping the members in

good standing, all membership books to be turned in, to be kept in a secret place, members to destroy all Communist Party literature, and so forth and so on, that they might have in their possession, that is, in the place where they lived.

The restriction as to the size of the cell was for security reasons, because a small group could meet with a greater degree of security than a larger group. The establishment of illegal printing plants in the various cities and key industrial areas where the printed material of the 7089 Party could be gotten out with the maximum amount of security and safety. The establishment of other means of getting out printed material such as through the establishment of places equipped with the mimeograph machines. It also dealt with the question of shaking off those individuals of the law enforcement agencies who were keeping known Communists under surveillance. It dealt at-length telling how to shake off these elements who were shadowing Communists. There were suggestions based upon the experiences of the old Bolsheviks under the Czar.

THE WITNESS: No. The document also dealt with the subject of using mail drops for the receipt of highly secret confidential messages that passed between the upper echelons and the lower echelons of the Party. The question of using the mails in order to circumvent postal inspection. It dealt with the use of secret codes in connection with the transmission of secret information as a means of lining up the higher echelons with the lower echelons of the Party.

The work of Communist Party cells in the basic and key industries of the nation, the work of Communist Party fractions within trade unions, civic, fraternal and other organizations. Also it outlined some of the techniques and methods developed by the old Bolsheviks in distribution of literature under conditions of suppression and repression and illegality.

7092 THE WITNESS: J. Peters was instructor at the school on this subject matter, and the lectures that he delivered were based upon the material contained in the document written by Lazar M. Kaganovich.

Q. Were these instructions given to you by Peters at that school that you attended, that secret school? A. Yes, that is correct.

7093 Q. You testified, did you not, that it was a secret school? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were any steps taken in your district, District 4—

Q. —to implement this underground apparatus? Were active steps taken?

THE WITNESS: In the Buffalo District I was instructed to purchase mimeograph machines to be put in a secret
7094 place for the purpose of getting out literature in cases of emergency, that is, in case there was a legal move to outlaw or suppress the Party and the Party activities. I was also instructed to get the various sections of the Communist Party in the district to do likewise and to indoctrinate the leadership of the Party for just such an emergency.

7097 Q. Did the Communist Party, while you were active in it, have any policy with reference to disclosing or resisting efforts to obtain information as to its records, other than membership lists? A. The Communist Party policy during the time that I was a member, in connection with the minutes of the meetings, was as follows: The only authorization that we had to give out copies of the minutes of meetings of committees in our district was the transmission of five copies of all minutes to the Central

7098 Office of the Communist Party. The purpose of the five copies, as was explained to me at the time—

THE WITNESS: I was told in connection with the five copies of all minutes, to be sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party, that it was for the purpose of supplying the Communist International and certain of its departments with the activities of the Party leaders and members in a given district, and that it was used for the evaluation of the work of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Who told you this and when?

THE WITNESS: William Weiner, Earl Browder, Jack Stachel, J. Peters and others when I became district organizer of the Communist Party in Buffalo.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: Where did these conversations take place, in New York or Buffalo?

THE WITNESS: In New York City, at the national office of the Party.

Apart from the supplying of the center and the Communist International with minutes, no one else outside of myself or my successor as district organizer had any access to the minutes of any meeting of any committee of the Communist Party in District No. 4.

As far as any outsider of the Party, definitely out. No minutes would be given to any members of the Party upon request by such member, unless a question arose involving the said member in some political controversy in which it was necessary to produce the minutes in order to affirm or contradict some particular statement that was made in a committee. In other words, apart from what I have stated, the minutes of all meetings of all committees were absolutely and strictly secret and confidential.

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q Were the meetings of the Party open to the Public?

7100 A. The Communist Party meetings of the National Committee, the various commissions of the Party such as the trade union commission, the agrarian commission, the women's commission, the organization commission, the agitation and propaganda commission, the state committees, the state bureaus, the district committees, the section committees, the Communist Party fractions, the Communist Party shop nuclei, the Communist Party street nuclei, were all closed meetings, restricted only to

7101 members of the Communist Party. There was only one exception to that rule, and that exception was granted by a higher committee of the Party. Only on occasions would they permit a street unit to have an open unit meeting, and at that open unit meeting they would invite a few non-party people who were prospective recruits for the Party. They would permit them to do that occasionally, and they would have to get a decision of a higher committee in order to do so. That is the only instance that I know where the Party permits a non-party person to attend any of the meetings of the Party.

Q. Will you tell the Board what the purpose of the secret methods which you have described here was, if you know?

THE WITNESS: The purpose of this secrecy was to prevent the law enforcement agencies and, as the Communists spoke of them, agents of the capitalist class, the capitalists or the fascists, the enemies of Communism from knowing what was decided on at meetings of the Communist Party, number one, and number two, to keep them from knowing who are the members of the Communist Party and where they live, work and operate.

By MR. PAISLEY:

7102 Q. Why did the Party not want these so-called enemies of the Communist Party to know these things?

Q. In other words, what was back of their desire that these individuals not know about their operations? A. Because it destroys the conspiratorial nature of the Party movement itself.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: The objection is overruled.

On this last statement, who said anything to you about the purpose?

THE WITNESS: I was taught in the National Training School in connection with my studies of the speeches of Stalin on the American Communist Party, and you will find in Stalin's speech where he speaks of the danger of exposing the conspiratorial nature of the Communist Party activities.

MR. LAFOLLETTE: You studied that in the school?

THE WITNESS: That is right in Stalin's speeches
7103 on the American Communist Party you will find where Stalin himself states it.

7118 - Q. I will ask you this question, then, Mr. Johnson: Do you know of any instance during your membership in the Communist Party of the United States in which the Communist Party of the United States opposed any decision of the Communist International?

THE WITNESS: During the time that I was in the Communist Party I do not know of one single instance where the Communist Party of the United States has opposed a decision of the Communist International.

7122 / Q. Subsequent to that time did the Party in the Daily Worker advise the members that you had been expelled? A. I was told that such an article was written in the Daily Worker.

Q. Did you ever see it? A. I only saw it a short
7123 time ago.

Q. I show you a copy of the Daily Worker of August 16, 1940, a copy of which has been marked Petitioner's Exhibit 294—

(The document referred to was marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit No. 294.)

By MR. PAISLEY:

Q. —and I call your attention to the item in the left-hand column headed "Workers' Enemies Exposed." Is that the article that you said you read? A. Yes, this is the article that I saw only recently.

7127

CROSS EXAMINATION

7130 Q. Haven't you admitted under oath that you have
7131 testified falsely in some prior proceedings? A. I
stated at the time that I testified in the Steve Nelson
case in Pittsburgh that when I was asked if I had stated in
prior testimony that I worked as an undercover agent for
the FBI, I stated in reply to that question that I did not
answer that question to the affirmative when asked if I had
worked for the FBI because of the fact that during the time
I was sworn to secrecy by the Government with regard to
that particular phase of the work, and it was only about two
weeks or so before I testified in Pittsburgh that the FBI told
me that it was not necessary any longer to keep the fact
that I was a former undercover agent of the FBI a secret,
that I was free to state publicly my past connections and
services to the FBI. That was the only instance that I
recall in all of my testimony when that sort of question was
raised, and I stated there at the time that I was sworn by
secrecy at that time not to reveal that or the methods and
operations of undercover agents for the FBI. The FBI
released me as far as stating my past connections with the
FBI, but it did not release me from the secrecy with regard
to the methods and operations of undercover agents of the
FBI. I so stated that in Pittsburgh and I stated it under
oath.

Q. Weren't you asked these questions in that connection in the Pittsburgh case, in the Nelson case, page 4545:

7132 "Do you remember testifying here yesterday that you didn't tell the whole truth in the International Workers Order trial in New York before the Supreme Court? "Answer: Yes, that is true."

Were you asked that question and did you make that answer?

7133 THE WITNESS: I don't know whether—I think that that question has been taken out of the text of the testimony. I think the question that you are reading refers to a question that was asked me by the counsel for the IWO at the IWO trial, if I had been in contact with or worked for some agency of the Federal Government, and I stated at that particular time, "No," because I was under oath not to reveal the fact that I was connected as an undercover agent with the FBI. That is what he is referring to there.

By MR. MARCANTONIO:

Q. I am not asking you about the questions asked you at the IWO trial. Do you recall Mr. McTernan? A. Yes. He asked me that question in connection with my testimony on that subject matter at the IWO trial.

Q. You remember being asked this question and making the answer that I have just read to you at the Pittsburgh Trial? A. If it was in connection with that, yes, subject matter.

Q. Then were you asked this question:

7134 "Question: You didn't tell the whole truth in that proceeding because of your instructions from the FBI?"

And did you make this answer: "Yes, I did state that."

"Question: And you were under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in that case, too, weren't you?"

And you said "Yes."

Is that correct? A. If the record shows that, that was my answer.

Q. Is there any doubt that that was your answer? A. I presume you are reading from the record.

Q. I am reading from the record, but I am asking you do you recall being asked that question and making that answer.

A. Yes, I recall that question and that answer.

Q. Do you recall being asked these questions and making these answers, page 4529, by Mr. McTernan:

"Question: You testified as a Government witness before the United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, in the case of one Nat Yanish at San Francisco, California, on February 26 and March 7135 1, 1948, did you not?

"Answer: The Nat Yanish case was in 1947.

"Question: Didn't you testify in 1948?

"Answer: Yes."

Do you recall being asked those questions and making those answers? A. Yes.

7144 Q. Mr. Witness, I am going to show you the following questions and answers, and in order to save time, Mr. Paisley, we will have these questions and answers read into the record and the witness can say whether or not he was asked those questions. You look them over and then you can say whether or not you were asked those questions and whether you made those answers.

7145 "Question: You are not answering my question. That answer you gave in the Yanish case was not the truth.

"Answer: It was the truth so far as I feel that I had made a prior commitment which involved the security of my Government, and in view of the fact that I feel that I was perfectly justified in maintaining the confidence that the FBI had placed in me.

"Question: Do you regard your obligation to tell the truth when you take an oath—

"Answer: I—

"Question: Just a minute. I want to finish this question and I would like you to wait until I finish it so you will know what it is you are answering. Do you regard your oath to tell the truth in any proceeding in which you appear as a witness to be qualified and limited by your commitments to the FBI?

"Answer: I feel this way, counsel—

"Question: Would you answer my question?"

Then there was colloquy between the attorneys and the court and then the question was read as follows:

"Question: Do you regard your oath to tell the truth in any proceeding in which you appear as a witness to be qualified and limited by your commitments to the FBI? Answer that yes or no.

"Answer: Yes, with a reservation.

7146 "Question: And you took that oath—

"Answer: Just a minute."

Then there is more colloquy between the court and counsel. Then:

"Answer: My reservation, precisely is this, that the security of our nation—"

Do you follow me? A. Yes.

Q. (continuing)

"—that the security of our nation requires that the utmost secrecy be maintained with regard to techniques and methods of operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the organizations that are under investigation, the individuals that are under investigation, and for that reason I feel that my promise to the FBI to maintain that secrecy and that confidence is not in the least a violation of any oath that I have taken here; and if counsel wants to consider the fact that I did not reveal the fact that I had been working for

the FBI, which would have been a betrayal of my trust to the FBI at that time, as lying under oath, then let counsel make the most of it.

"Question: Mr. Johnson, in short—"

Then Mr. McTernan and the Court have a colloquy.

"Question: Now, in short, Mr. Johnson, if the FBI tells you not to disclose a fact in the course of your testimony which you are called upon in your testimony
7147 to disclose, you will not disclose it; is that right?

"Answer: I would not under any conceivable conditions.

"Question: And if the FBI wants you to lie about something in your testimony when you are asked a question, you will do that also; is that right?

"Answer: The FBI has never on any occasion asked me to lie about anything. The only thing the FBI instructed me to do, not to reveal to enemies of this Government the techniques and methods of operation.

"Question: When you were testifying in the Yanish case you were testifying before a tribunal of the United States Government, weren't you?

"Answer: Beg pardon.

"Question: When you were testifying in the Yanish case you were testifying before a tribunal of the United States Government, weren't you?

"Answer: That is correct.

"Question: And when you said that you had not filed any statement, you were telling a lie, weren't you?

"Answer: If you want to call it that, counsel, you may.

"Question: And you were telling that lie because of your instructions from the FBI, weren't you?

"Answer: I was carrying out the oath and obligations—

"Question: Will you answer my question?

7148 "Answer: I will if you will permit me, counsel.
Don't try to put words in my mouth.

"Question: I would rather have an answer than a speech for a change, Mr. Johnson."